DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 356 SP 007 524

TITLE	Teacher Education Programs.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Legislature, Olympia. Joint Committee on Higher Education.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	37p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; *State Surveys; *Teacher Education; Teacher Experience; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This is a report from the Washington State Legislature, Joint Committee on Higher Education which reviews teacher education programs throughout the state. The report complies with terms of House Resolution 72-71, which instructs educators to: a) visit campuses with schools or colleges of education to understand problems associated with the preparation of teachers; b) recommend procedural approaches, organizational structure, and timing for implementing innovative and imaginative programming in teacher education; and c) confer with interested organizations and groups to develop recommendations concerning evaluation of teacher education programs. The report presents some general findings on a) selection and admission of students to teacher education programs; b) innovative and alternative programs; c) evaluation of programs, students, faculty members, and field supervisors; d) implementation of the 1971 certification standards; and e) the role of field experience in teacher education programs. Detailed analysis of these findings is published as "Summary of Survey Results, Teacher Education Programs," The appendixes present House Resolution 72-71, the House Concurrent Resolution, the Task Force Roster, and a survey questionnaire. (BRB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 025356

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 007 534

Washington State Legislature

JOINT COMMITTEE ON

HIGHER EDUCATION

Teacher Education Programs

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Task Force Roster - Teacher Education

Representative Donn Charnley Chairman	Jt. Committee on Higher Education
Senator Bruce Wilson Vice-Chairman	Jt. Committee on Higher Education
Representative Dale E. Hoggins 21826 - 95th Avenue North Edmonds, Washington 98020	Jt. Committee on Education
Terry McCarthy Senior Fiscal Analyst Legislative Building	Legislative Budget Committee
Dr. Bill Chance Deputy Coordinator Planning & Research 908 East Fifth, Olympia	Council on Higher Education
Dr. Lillian Cady Associate for Teacher Education Old Capitol Building	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dean Winfield Fountain* School of Education Seattle University Seattle, Washington 98122	Washington Friends of Higher Education
Prof. George Brain, Dean College of Education Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99163	Council of Presidents' Representative

Dr. Barbara Howard
Study Research Director, JCHE

*Replacing Dr. Don Patterson 12/72

State of Washington

SEN. GORDON SANDISON, *Chairman*
Port Angeles
REP. PEGGY JOAN MAXIE, *Secretary*
Seattle
REP. JOHN B. RABEL, *Exec. Comm.*
Seattle
REP. MAX E. BENITZ
Prosser
SEN. DAMON R. CANFIELD
Sunnyside
REP. DONN CHARNLEY
Seattle
SEN. JAMES E. KEEFE
Spokane
SEN. HARRY B. LEWIS
Olympia
REP. RICHARD L. SMYTHE
Vancouver
SEN. JOE STORTINI
Tacoma

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

J. ARNOLD BRICKER, Executive Secretary

January 2, 1973

Governor Daniel J. Evans and
Members of the Legislature:

The Joint Committee on Higher Education was directed by House Resolution 72-71 to visit college campuses and confer with interested organizations in conducting a study of teacher preparation programs in both public and private institutions of higher education. The resolution emphasized an inquiry into "innovative and imaginative programming."

As a result of its inquiries, the Committee concluded that the field of teacher education is complex and challenging, but that the schools and departments of education are making concerted efforts to serve the needs of their students and the school community at large. The Committee conducted an intensive survey of current practices and problems in teacher preparation, and determined that the subject warrants further investigation of the most appropriate means for encouraging continued development in light of the companion needs for accountability and flexibility. The legislative proposal was drafted to accomplish this objective.

The report of the Joint Committee on Higher Education is herewith submitted for your consideration. We hope that the recommendations will contribute to the development of responsible state policy.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Sandison

GORDON SANDISON
Chairman

GS:IK

ROOM 218, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504 TELEPHONE 753-5390 AREA CODE 206

TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to comply with the terms of House Resolution 72-71, which directed the Joint Committee on Higher Education to: (1) "visit campuses having schools or colleges of education . . . for the purpose of understanding first-hand the general problems associated with the preparation of teachers"; (2) "recommend procedural approaches, organizational structure, and timing for implementing innovative and imaginative programming to bear on the preparation of teachers"; and (3) "confer with the interested organizations and groups to determine the means for identifying methods to develop recommendations concerning . . . evaluation of teacher education programs." The resolution further laid out six specific procedures which might be followed to improve teacher education, and directed the Joint Committee to review these recommendations. (See H.R. 72-71, Appendix A)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Because of the magnitude and complexity of any review of teacher education, the Committee recommends that the Task Force continue to explore alternatives for improvement, and hopefully to serve as a catalyst in extending the cooperative effort undertaken by the schools of education until Recommendation #2 can be implemented.*

2. *It is further recommended that the Joint Committee establish a select committee to assume responsibility for expansion of the study. The select committee should be composed of knowledgeable citizens, teacher educators, students, and representatives of the Council on Higher Education, the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Joint Committee on Higher Education, the Joint Committee on Education, and the Legislative Budget Committee, as well as institutions of higher education, school districts, and the professional associations to study: (a) the most effective means for implementing change in teacher education; (b) the most appropriate role for state policy in this area; and (c) the most suitable means of evaluating the effectiveness of such programs.*

3. *Recognizing the efforts that have been made by the colleges in a number of areas specified in the resolution, as evidenced by the Task Force survey, it is further recommended that these efforts be continued.*

4. *To focus attention on the current state of innovative programming, the Joint Committee on Higher Education should request a joint hearing early in the 1973 Legislative Session of the standing House and Senate Committees on Education and Higher Education, at which representatives of the colleges will be invited to discuss their programs.*

BACKGROUND

The quality of college and university programs of teacher preparation has been a concern of public officials, educators, and

citizens for many years, but seems to have gained particular emphasis in the 1960's, particularly after the studies of James B. Conant and James D. Koerner.

In this state, several trends have been evident, the most notable of which has been the movement toward "performance-based" or "competency-based" teacher education programs. This concept, embodied in the 1971 Teacher Certification standards adopted by the State Board of Education, holds that programs of teacher preparation should be directed toward the development of skill in performing identifiable tasks related to teaching in the public schools.[1] Briefly, the 1971 Standards propose that teacher preparation programs be developed under a new administrative structure called a "consortium," to be composed of three parties, representing the colleges and universities, the local school districts, and the professional associations of school personnel. The Legislative Budget Committee report goes on to indicate that:

> Under the direction of this organization, the individual teacher-education student will be involved in an on-going learning experience based on: (1) a diagnosis of his needs; (2) a prescription of learning tasks; (3) the adoption of an appropriate instructional methodology; and, (4) intermittent evaluation.

As pointed out by the Legislative Budget Committee, the full impact of implementing the 1971 Standards will not be known for several years, but they are certainly a reflection of a major trend in this field in Washington State.

---

[1]A detailed examination of the 1971 Standards is contained in Legislative Budget Committee, The 1971 Teacher Certification Standards, Revised Memorandum, September 22, 1972.

During this same period, Representative Richard Smythe became interested in problems associated with teacher preparation. In 1971 he issued two reports, No Action, and So You Think You're Educating Teachers. House Resolution 72-71 was an outgrowth of those studies.

To meet the directives of the resolution, the Joint Committee on Higher Education created a Task Force composed of representatives of the Committee, the Joint Committee on Education, the Council on Higher Education, the Legislative Budget Committee, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the institutions of higher education, both public and private. (See Appendix C)

In its early deliberations, the Task Force concluded that there was no regular, published source of information concerning the conduct of the college and university programs of teacher preparation. Annual reports submitted to the State Board of Education were helpful, but did not deal directly with the issues raised in the study resolution. For these reasons, and because it became apparent that it would be impossible for the Joint Committee on Higher Education to visit all of the campuses in the few months remaining before the 1973 Session of the Legislature, the Task Force decided to conduct a survey (see Appendix D for survey questionnaire). Despite the fact that the questionnaire was complex and lengthy, full responses were received from all of the 15 institutions in the state which conduct programs of

teacher preparation.[2]

FINDINGS

The results of the survey have been summarized in a 65-page document, Summary of Survey Results, Teacher Education Programs. Because of time limitations and definitional problems, a statistical section of the survey was deferred for later refinement. The full Summary is available for review at the Joint Committee's office, but the following narrative attempts to generalize the survey findings.

---

[2]The colleges and universities surveyed include: public institutions - Central Washington State College, Eastern Washington State College, University of Washington, Washington State University, and Western Washington State College; private institutions: Fort Wright College, Gonzaga University, Pacific Lutheran University, St. Martin's College, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle University, University of Puget Sound, Walla Walla College, Whitman College, and Whitworth College. Sincere appreciation is due to all of the individuals, including deans and directors, who responded to the survey.

Selection and Admission of Students to the Professional Education Program

The point at which a student is formally admitted to the professional program varies among the colleges, and seems to come somewhat later in the public institutions than in the private. The earliest admission is in the sophomore year; the latest reported is in the junior/senior year at Eastern and Walla Walla College.

Criteria and procedures for admission. Thirteen of the institutions reported using grade point as one measure for admission to teacher education. The grade point standard ranged from 2.0 ("C") overall to 2.5 at Western (as of the 1972-73 academic year), Seattle University, and Whitworth. Grade point is not the only criterion at most institutions, however. Several require completion of specific courses, such as Introduction to Education and the introductory Educational Psychology course; others call for recommendations by faculty members or the major department; some require screening interviews; and a few use standard testing devices such as the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the Purdue English Placement test. Personal characteristics and attitude are screened at the University of Washington, Pacific Lutheran, St. Martin's, Seattle Pacific, and Whitworth, among others. Preliminary laboratory experience or early field work must also be completed before admission in some cases.

The formality and complexity of the admission procedure also varies among the colleges. As noted, several institutions require formal interviews; most have application forms or questionnaires; analysis of grade transcripts is common. At least one college, Eastern,

encourages its candidates for admission to submit video tapes of themselves working with children.

Participants responsible for the admitting process are usually made up of Education faculty, frequently organized into formal committees. Faculty of major departments are often consulted, as are formal advisers, counseling personnel, and frequently field supervisors or supervising teachers. Self-evaluation by the student was cited in several responses.

A common thread among the responses appeared to point to the need for becoming more familiar with the qualifications of individual candidates, through smaller classes (Eastern), or more staff time, or money (University of Washington, Washington State, Seattle University, University of Puget Sound). The obverse of the desirability of being selective was pointed out in Central's response: the perceived public attitude that it is an individual's personal right to study what he chooses.

Academic Advising and Career Counseling

Survey responses indicated that the responsibility for advising and counseling within the teacher education programs is spread widely. Most colleges reported that the entire Education faculty is involved, as well as the chairmen of the academic departments, particularly in the case of secondary education students. A number of colleges, particularly the larger ones, reported that there are discrete advising and counseling offices or faculty members and staff assigned to advising and counseling.

The approach to advising varies. Two institutions, Western and the University of Puget Sound, reported that advising is not required.

The others indicated that the number of contacts per student ranges from two or three each year to as many as three or four appointments per quarter. The period during which advising most frequently occurs is that just prior to registration each term. Some institutions reported, however, that they require adviser's appointments at the time of admission to professional education and application for graduation. Washington State has a two-day orientation session for freshmen.

Career counseling tends to be somewhat less formal than academic advising, although most colleges report that they deal with career opportunities intensively during the early professional courses. In most cases, also, they indicated that faculty and staff were always on call.

Testimony before the Joint Committee and discussion in the Task Force revealed that advising, particularly with respect to career opportunities, is an area which calls for improvement at many schools. Because counseling is essentially a communications process, its success depends largely on the attitude of the students, and the current sense of independence and self-awareness among students works against the more traditional, formal counseling procedures. Negative student reaction to required counseling was specifically cited by Western; another response, from Eastern, cited the difficulty of persuading a student to change his field of preparation once he has chosen a goal. Again, an underlying factor is the philosophical value held by many that each individual should be free to pursue the career of his choice.

Program Development

Professional program alternatives. Responses to the survey question about the kinds of program choices available to teacher education students indicated that a number of colleges have in the last few years made revisions emphasizing increased field experience (see tables on following pages). While the traditional elementary and secondary "tracks" still predominate in terms of the number of institutions responding, particularly among the private colleges, several variations were found that emphasize field and laboratory training. The University of Washington, for example, reported seven options, while Central reported six. Washington State has taken a unified approach, having adopted its COPE (Competency Oriented Personalized Education) program in 1970, in which all candidates enroll.

In 1969, Western introduced a clinical option, which has grown to cover four field centers in a consortium arrangement among the college, the respective school districts, and the professional association; students take their full training in these centers for two full academic quarters. Seattle Pacific also operates in a consortium arrangement in which students spend a full year in the field. At the University of Puget Sound, students begin their field experience at the start of the sophomore year, in the first professional education course.

Innovative program developments. Each institution has attempted to adapt imaginative approaches to its own setting and goals, but several common threads run through the responses to the question

concerning innovative features of the professional programs:

1. Much more emphasis is placed on individual needs than was true in the past. The term "individualization" appeared frequently in terms of learning rates, classroom approach, and field and laboratory work.

2. In pursuit of the goal of making teacher training more realistic, added weight is given to earlier and more extensive experience in laboratory settings and in public school settings; the common term for the latter is "field experience".

3. There appeared to be general commitment to the concept that teacher training should be approached in such a fashion as to develop demonstrable "competencies", the so-called "competency-based education" approach.

4. Teacher preparation should be more closely adapted to the social conditions found in the public schools, especially in urban and rural low-income areas.

Responses citing the need for further innovation also stressed these elements.

Obstacles to innovation. The problems most commonly cited in program improvement were, not surprisingly, staff time and money. Where more detailed responses were given, a number of factors were revealed. These included the natural resistance of some individuals to change, the fact that many public school personnel who are expected to participate in student training have not themselves been trained in the newer skills, the absence of a well-defined management system and funding pattern for the implementation of the 1971 guidelines for teacher certification, and the need for greater assurance that

the competency-based approach is more effective than the traditional "courses and credits" model.

Program Evaluation

The survey questionnaire contained a detailed section on the techniques employed by the colleges to evaluate their programs. It concerned assessment of: the professional program itself, the professional faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and students who complete the teacher preparation program.

Evaluation of the professional program. Two basic types of assessment strategies were reported: those that were external to the institution, and those that had been developed internally. There are several accreditation agencies, but the most common for general programs are the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, and the State Board of Education. Not all colleges in the state are accredited by NCATE and NASHS, but the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education makes periodic evaluation visitations to all institutions with teacher preparation programs, and all colleges are required to submit annual reports to the Board.

The most common internal evaluation method is through follow-up contacts with first-year teachers who have completed the college's preparation program. This varies in scope and complexity, but the written questionnaire was reported most frequently; several colleges reported that they also conduct regular visitations to most first-year teachers who have taken positions within the state. In most cases, school principals are also surveyed about the performance of

the first-year teachers from the respective institutions. Other strategies reported included preparation of a long-range program plan, an annual faculty retreat, research studies specifically aimed at program evaluation, and standing faculty committee studies.

Evaluation of professional faculty. Generally, the performance of professional education faculty is evaluated in the same manner as that for other college faculty. Student evaluation and peer evaluation are the most common techniques, in addition to more informal methods of assessment. In some instances, professional faculty are required to submit annual activity reports. The normal retention, promotion, and tenure process provides another measure of faculty competence.

Evaluation of field supervisors. In most cases, college personnel who supervise field experiences are evaluated in much the same way as other faculty. The process tends to be somewhat informal, although several colleges utilize student evaluation forms. Initial screening procedures in the selection process are also utilized to assess competence. Feedback from school personnel, including principals and cooperating teachers is also a significant factor.

Evaluation of cooperating teachers. A considerable portion of the responsibility for evaluating the work of cooperating teachers rests with the school districts, primarily the principals and, in the larger districts, the personnel directors. In practice, the college supervisors work closely with district representatives; emphasis is on evaluation at the selection stage. Classroom observations by college supervisors also serve as input in the evaluation process.

Throughout the study, discussion revealed that the role of the

supervising teacher is a critical one, and the college's relationship with the district highly sensitive. Though difficult to measure objectively, the ability of a teacher to supervise a college student does not appear necessarily to be related to the ability to teach. Some excellent teachers, for example, find it difficult to share a classroom with a student teacher

Evaluation of graduates. In addition to the common methods of evaluating the teacher as a student on the college campus, several methods are employed to evaluate teacher education graduates. The most common is the first-year follow-up. The University of Washington uses a formal package composed of evaluation surveys completed during field experience and presented to the candidate before practice teaching; Western employs an evaluation manual and form which are completed by the cooperating teacher.

Adequacy of evaluation procedures. Most colleges reported that assessment procedures are under continuing review. Several noted that they hoped to reinstate follow-up visitatons to first-year teachers, which had been suspended because of budgetary restrictions. Central has requested funding for a faculty position for program planning and evaluation, and has recommended creation of a campus-wide deanship for research to evaluate all programs, including teacher education. The University of Washington is planning a research project to study program evaluation. Western has voted to create a standing faculty committee to review its program, and plans to introduce a formal procedure for evaluating field supervisors. The most commonly reported need was for development of more objective evaluation measures and more definitive standards.

Teacher Educators' School Experiences

One set of questions in the survey was designed to deal with what experiences and training teacher educators themselves receive.

Training for cooperating teachers. Most of the colleges reported that they provide some formal training for the cooperating teachers who supervise their students' field experiences, particularly student teaching. Specialized college courses in the techniques of supervision of teaching were commonly reported, as were the provision of instructional materials in the form of manuals or handbooks. In most instances, the special courses are offered on a subsidized, or tuition-free basis. Variations include special seminars and conferences, as well as micro-teaching laboratory experiences. Several colleges reported a desire to expand such offerings.

Faculty experiences in the common schools. The survey revealed that relatively high proportions of education faculty members at the colleges had themselves had experience in the common schools. The proportion of faculty members who had taught public school ranged as high as 100 percent, with the low reported as 70 percent. The range for faculty who currently observe students in the classroom was not quite as high, but 11 of the 15 colleges reported that 70 percent or more of their faculty participate in such observations. Supervisors of student teachers naturally spend considerable portions of their time in the schools.

Follow-up of Graduates

Reference was made earlier to the common practice by the colleges

of conducting some type of follow-up survey of their recent graduates. Several of the private colleges, as well as Washington State University and Western, conduct formal visitations to the schools where first-year teachers are employed; school administrators are usually interviewed at the same time about the performance of the new teachers. Central specifically reported it had terminated visitations because of lack of funds; Eastern also cited financial limitations as a barrier.

Most of the colleges that do not conduct visitations pursue their follow-up by means of mail questionnaires. Again, these surveys usually seek responses from school administrators as well as recent graduates. Few institutions reported formal procedures for follow-up beyond the first year, but most indicated that a significant proportion of their graduates participate in program assessment when they return for the fifth-year program.

Student Field Experiences

Experiences required of the teacher education student in the public schools were the subject of another segment of the survey.[3]

These field experiences fell into three major categories: observations conducted in connection with a formal college class, the so-called "September Experience," and student teaching.

Classroom observations normally take place in the Introduction to Education course, in Educational Psychology, and in the teaching

---

[3]A systematic survey of field experiences of both students and teacher educators is contained in Superintendent of Public Instruction, Report of Feasibility Study . . . in accordance with Senate Floor Resolution 1972-23, October 31, 1972.

methods classes. Time spent in the classroom varies, but it is not uncommon for a student to spend 60-100 hours in the field during a single course. The "September Experience", required by many of the colleges, is designed to offer the student an opportunity to observe the planning and procedures attendant upon the opening of school in the fall, before the college term begins. This includes distribution of books and materials, organization of classes, assignment of teachers, and so on. Frequently, the college attempts to place the student in a district near his home town.

Student teaching, called an "internship" by some of the colleges, is required for all candidates. In most cases, it calls for full-time work in the classroom for an entire college term. In the programs with extended field experience, such as the clinical program at Western, students may take a full year of college courses and do their student teaching in a school setting.

Other kinds of experience include multi-media simulations (such as video-tapes), micro-teaching, tutoring, and serving as teacher's aides.

Contacts with college supervisors during field experience vary considerably, but survey responses indicated most students see a college supervisor at least weekly.

Selection of cooperating teachers. Almost universally, supervising teachers are selected by the college directors in interviews with school principals or district personnel directors. Several colleges reported that this is an area in which considerable research is needed, to make the selection process more objective and to assure better matching between the supervising teacher and the student, since this is such a personalized relationship.

Problems with field experience. In addition to matching the student with the supervising teacher, the colleges reported several other problems, usually related to effective communication with district representatives. Among these were developing supervisory skills; establishing equal partnerships between the college, the district, and the professional association; saturating the field with laboratory experiences at certain times; difficulty in securing involvement of college departments other than education; and assuring that supervising teachers are adequately trained in current methods.

Implementation of the 1971 Certification Standards

As described briefly at an earlier stage in this report, it is likely that the adoption of the 1971 Guidelines for teacher certification will have a significant effect on the manner in which teacher education programs are offered. How great this impact will be is not yet known, but an attempt was made in the survey to secure an overall impression of when the objectives embodied in the Guidelines will be implemented, and what problems are foreseen in implementation.

Objective: Consortia are to plan and implement teacher education programs. Most of the colleges reported their desire to involve consortia in planning all of their programs. Time reported for implementation ranged from two to five years, although some of the colleges reported they could not realistically set a target.

Problems foreseen in consortium development included: uncertainty as to the degree of influence of the professional association;

securing adequate funding to meet the higher costs anticipated for consortium development; developing management systems to assure effective operation of the consortia; assuring participation of the districts; and finding sufficient released time for all participants to devote to consortium operation.

Objective: Programs are to be performance-based. Timing and commitment to this objective were similar to those for consortium development.

Most of the institutions reported that the major obstacles to achieving this objective are time and money, but several also pointed to the difficulties of developing evaluative techniques and standards, providing sufficient staff and re-educating faculty, and developing and describing competencies.

Objective: Trainees are to demonstrate entry and exit competencies. Problems associated with this objective are similar to those for performance-based programming. They include: identifying valid competencies for a wide variety of subject matter fields, reaching agreement on standards, establishing adequate measurement techniques, and securing the necessary funding. Central noted the philosophical difficulty of requiring demonstration of entry competencies as running counter to the spirit of occupational free choice.

Objective: Field experiences are to occur earlier and be more extensive. Responses were more optimistic with respect to this objective than any of the others. Several of the colleges reported no obstacles, and those that did cited such problems as financial and housing needs of students, degree of inflexibility in some

academic disciplines, staffing, costs to both the colleges and the districts, and how to reward cooperating teachers.

Objective: Follow-up and in-service opportunities are to be ensured. Funding, again, was reported as an obstacle, as were the mobility of teachers, which makes follow-up difficult; the suitability of University credit for in-service training as requested by the professional associations; the fact that in-service training programs may not be entirely acceptable to all districts; and released time for staff to provide these services.

CONCLUSIONS

When the survey Summary was completed in the fall of 1972, it was agreed, that, while the Summary represented the first statewide attempt to review teacher education programs, considerable additional effort would be required to reach definitive policy proposals for the Legislature.

The Task Force found that the colleges are highly sensitive to the problems surrounding the development of high-quality teaching professionals, and are attempting innovative programming on a variety of fronts. There was general agreement, however, that high priority should be placed on maintaining flexibility to meet the diverse needs of the students, the institutions, the school districts, and the clientele.

Among the questions yet to be resolved are:

(1) What is the appropriate role for state policy in teacher education programs, particularly, what legislative directives are suitable, if institutions are to operate in a framework calling for both accountability and sufficient flexibility to encourage innovation?

(2) What is the proper role of other participants in the teacher preparation process beside the institutions - - including students, professional associations, federal agencies, and interested citizens?

(3) Given the repeated responses indicating that the current trends in teacher preparation are limited by financial constraints, how can cost-finding mechanisms be refined to greater precision, and what new funding patterns are required? and

(4) What are the most effective strategies for continuing evaluation of teacher preparation programs?

Continued study by the Joint Committee on Higher Education, with the creation of a select committee representing the interested parties is proposed in House Concurrent Resolution _____ (Appendix B).

List of Appendices

Appendix A	House Resolution 72-71
Appendix B	House Concurrent Resolution __
Appendix C	Task Force Roster
Appendix D	Survey Questionnaire

APPENDIX A

IN THE LEGISLATURE
of the
STATE OF WASHINGTON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Resolution No. 72-71 by Representatives Rabel, Kiskaddon, King, Gladder and Charnley

WHEREAS, A recently completed survey of teacher education in the State of Washington has produced a vast array of information about the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers in the public and private colleges and universities of Washington; and

WHEREAS, This survey made a number of imaginative observations and conclusions concerning ways to improve the teacher training programs in colleges and universities, including recommendations that:

(1) Classroom teachers be given authority to guide teacher training curriculum.
(2) College professors of education should be required to teach periodically in public school classrooms.
(3) All college and university education classes should be reviewed to determine their worth in relation to the total educational program.
(4) Enrollment limitations should be established for colleges of education, accompanied by early identification and recruitment of prospective teachers.
(5) Professional education for all prospective teachers should begin and end with practice teaching.
(6) All first year teachers should receive intensive help to improve their understanding and control of problems in discipline and conduct; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature recognizes that all citizens of this state and all professional educators charged with the responsibility of preparing future teachers are committed to finding better ways to improve teacher training programs; and

WHEREAS, Ten private colleges within the State of Washington have schools of education which have in recent years on the average graduated twenty-two percent of the teacher output, most of which have joined the state education system;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the House of Representatives, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education be requested to visit campuses having schools or colleges of education for the preparation of teachers in order to talk with students, teachers, and administrators for the purpose of understanding first-hand the general problems associated with the preparation of teachers, and for the specific purpose of reviewing the above survey recommendations and suggesting further appropriate recommendations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education, with the cooperation of the Council on Higher Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction and institutions of higher education,

recommend procedural approaches, organization structure, and timing for implementing innovative and imaginative programming to bear on the preparation of teachers; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education confer with the interested organizations and groups to determine the means for identifying methods to develop recommendations concerning the criteria to be used in the future for evaluation of teacher education programs in institutions of higher education in the State of Washington.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the state agencies concerned with educational planning for institutions of higher education, both public and private having schools of education, are hereby requested to cooperate with the Joint Committee on Higher Education in this undertaking.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education be requested to report the results of its inquiry, and any recommendations, to the 1973 Regular Session of the Washington State Legislature.

ADOPTED February 17, 1972.

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives February 17, 1972.

Malcolm McBeath

Malcolm McBeath, Chief Clerk
House of Representatives

APPENDIX B

WHEREAS, The Joint Committee on Higher Education has visited college campuses for the purpose of reviewing progress and problems in the field of teacher education, as directed by House Resolution 72-71; and

WHEREAS, The Joint Committee on Higher Education has conducted an intensive survey of current practices, including innovative and imaginative programming in the professional preparation of teachers at the fifteen public and private institutions offering such programs in this state, such survey having been reviewed by the institutions and being available for legislative examination; and

WHEREAS, The field of teacher preparation in Washington State is currently at a transitional stage, in which the 1971 standards for teacher certification and emerging concepts of competency-based training have only recently begun to be implemented on a state-wide basis; and

WHEREAS, Early attempts to assign program costs, either to the new certification program or to education programs affected in part by innovative efforts at the institutions, have indicated the need for further refinement; and

WHEREAS, The advent of innovative organizational patterns for teacher training involving common schools and teaching colleges and universities will require new management and program funding arrangements; and

WHEREAS, The Legislative Budget Committee has begun to gather data concerning the feasibility of developing a program funding model for teacher education under the terms of House Resolution 72-54; and

WHEREAS, Representatives of all parties at interest in teacher

preparation--including the Legislature and other state agencies, the public and private institutions of higher education, the school districts, the professional associations, and students have expressed deep concern with promoting improvements in teacher preparation within a framework of accountability coupled with a degree of flexibility sufficient to encourage experimentation; and

WHEREAS, Development of specific policy proposals at the state level requires an approach to program improvement involving board participation and an appropriate level of budget support;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education continue the study initiated under House Resolution 72-71; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, By the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education convene a select committee composed of knowledgeable citizens, teacher educators, students, and representatives of the Council on Higher Education, the State Board for Community College Education, the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Joint Committee on Higher Education, the Joint Committee on Education, and the Legislative Budget Committee, as well as institutions of higher education, school districts, and the professional associations, to conduct a study of:

(1) The most effective means of implementing change in teacher education;

(2) The most appropriate role for state policy in this area, given the wide variety of individual and institutional needs that are exhibited in teacher preparation programs; and

(3) The most suitable means of evaluating the effectiveness of such programs, and report its findings to the Joint Committee on Higher Education; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That, during the implementation of this study, the institutions shall continue to refine their

innovative programs, evaluate the effectiveness of their offerings, and provide the results of their evaluation to the Joint Committee on Higher Education; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education be authorized to consult formally with appropriate specialists in the field, including but not limited to, representatives of concerned agencies of the federal government and of national organizations involved in teacher preparation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education present its report and recommendations to the 1975 Session of the Legislature; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Legislative Budget Committee, in consultation with the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the senior institutions of higher education, develop appropriate program funding models for teacher training, to be reported to the 1975 Legislative Session.

APPENDIX C

Task Force Roster - Teacher Education

Representative Donn Charnley Chairman	Jt. Committee on Higher Education
Senator Bruce Wilson Vice-Chairman	Jt. Committee on Higher Education
Representative Dale E. Hoggins 21826 - 95th Avenue North Edmonds, Washington 98020	Jt. Committee on Education
Terry McCarthy Senior Fiscal Analyst Legislative Building	Legislative Budget Committee
Dr. Bill Chance Deputy Coordinator Planning & Research 908 East Fifth, Olympia	Council on Higher Education
Dr. Lillian Cady Associate for Teacher Education Old Capitol Building	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dean Winfield Fountain* School of Education Seattle University Seattle, Washington 98122	Washington Friends of Higher Education
Prof. George Brain, Dean College of Education Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99163	Council of Presidents' Representative

Dr. Barbara Howard
Study Research Director, JCHE

*Replacing Dr. Don Patterson 12/72

APPENDIX D

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The enclosed questionnaire has been sent to all schools and colleges of teacher preparation in Washington State. It is designed to provide information which will assist the Joint Committee on Higher Education in carrying out its study under House Resolution 72-71.

We would appreciate it very much if the survey can be completed by August 7. If there are any questions, please feel free to get in touch with Dr. Barbara Howard, staff analyst for the study.

DONN CHARNLEY, Study Chairman

Washington State
Undergraduate Teacher Education Programs
(1971-72)

Institution_____ Date_____

Address_____

Name/Position_____ Phone_____

1. Statistical Information

   a. Number of FTE faculty in education department (exclude field supervisors)_____

   b. Number of part-time faculty teaching in professional education program_____ Converted to FTE_____

   c. Percent of faculty parity under budget formula_____

   d. Number of full-time field supervisors_____ Converted to FTE_____

   e. Number of part-time field supervisors_____ Converted to FTE_____

   f. Budget for teacher education_____ Percent of total institution budget_____

   g. Number of FTE undergraduates formally admitted to teacher education_____ Percent of total undergraduate FTE enrollment_____

   h. Percentage of students who enroll and do not obtain certification_____ Percentage who enroll and voluntarily change or withdraw from program_____

      Percentage who enroll and are counseled out of program_____

   i. Percentage of a typical undergraduate's program spent in professional courses_____

2. Selection and Admission Procedures

   a. At what point(s) during undergraduate preparation are students admitted to teacher education?

   b. What criteria are used in selecting or admitting students to teacher education? If grade point is one criterion, please identify specific grade point requirement.

   c. Describe selection/admission procedure used. Do you believe current selection and admission procedures are adequate? If not, what techniques can you suggest for improvement? Describe any factors which inhibit improvement.

   d. Who participates in this process?

3. Academic Advising and Career Counseling

a. Which departments and individuals (by title) are responsible for advising students interested in teacher education?

b. How often each year do students regularly meet with advisors, counselors, or others responsible for advising them regarding teacher education? What would you estimate to be the average time spent by an advisor with a student each semester/quarter?

c. At what point(s) during undergraduate preparation are students required to meet with advisors? Counselors?

d. Describe provisions made for career counseling with students who express an interest in teacher education. Do you believe students receive sufficient career counseling? If not, can you define the obstacles to adequate career counseling?

4. Program Developments

a. If you have distinctively different programs or options or "tracks" (as distinguished from majors and teaching specialties), please describe them, identifying the factors or features which distinguish them.

What percentage of current teacher education students are enrolled in each program?

b. When were each of your major programs initiated?

What percentage of students enrolled in teacher education are affected by "a" and "b" above?

4. (continued)

c. Identify offerings of your current teacher education program which you consider to be experimental or "innovative," including the dates of their initiation, and funding sources. Include in the discussion a review of your approach to new philosophies of education, and how to make learning more exciting.

What percentage of students enrolled in teacher education participate in these innovative features of the program? _____

d. What further changes and innovations do you and your staff believe are needed in teacher education at your institution? Throughout the state?

e. In this process of change, have you "phased out" (or do you plan to) any older programs? Please describe, including utilization of faculty in older programs.

f. Can you isolate any factors which impede innovation or new directions in teacher education at your institution? Throughout the state?

5. Program Evaluation

a. Describe procedures and standards used for assessment/evaluation of:

(1) Your teacher education program.

(2) Performance of professional faculty.

(3) Performance of field supervisors.

(4) Selection of "master teachers," "supervising teachers," etc., in the cooperating school districts.

(5) Competence of persons completing your teacher education program, including field experience.

b. Are you satisfied with evaluation procedures and criteria now in use? If not, what would you change, strengthen, add?

6. Teacher Educators' Experiences and Training

a. Describe any special training you provide for school district personnel or field supervisors who work with undergraduate students, student teachers, and interns.

b. What percentage of your faculty responsible for teaching education courses (subject matter methods courses included) have had experience teaching in the common schools?_____ What percent spend time periodically observing students or student teachers in common schools?_____ What percent spend time periodically teaching common school students?_____ Is observation or teaching required? Describe the nature and extent of such observation or teaching.

7. Follow-up on Graduates

Do you have a formal procedure for following the early careers of your graduates? If so, please describe, noting how often you communicate with them (after first year? third year? other?), and who is responsible for this function. Can you provide a summary of recent responses?

8. Field Experience of Students

a. Please describe each of the major types of field experience that are required as part of your teacher preparation programs (examples: observation, September experience, tutoring, micro-teaching, student teaching, internships, etc.). Discuss when each occurs in the student's program, how extensive the experience is, who provides supervision, the ratio of supervising teachers to students, and how often college representatives meet with supervising teachers.

b. With how many school districts did you have cooperative field experience arrangements in the 1971-72 year? How many supervising teachers in each district? How are supervising teachers selected and assigned?

8. (continued)

c. How often during the field experience period do college supervisors meet with students for observation, seminars, formal instruction, individual discussion and counseling, etc.?

d. What is the ratio of college supervisors to students during the field experience?

e. Please describe any current problems with your field experience program, including selection of supervising teachers, placement of students, variety of field environments accessible to your students, etc.

Undergraduate Teacher Education Programs

9. Several objectives contained in the new standards for certification (Fourth Draft) are identified below. Please respond to questions which appear opposite each objective.

OBJECTIVE	Eventually what proportion of your program and what percent of students will be in programs based on this objective?	Are there major obstacles to implementation of this objective? Please explain.	When do you expect to complete implementation of this objective?
Consortia are to plan and implement preparation programs.			
Programs are to be performance-based.			
Persons in training are to demonstrate entry and exit competencies.			
Field experiences are to occur earlier and to be more extensive.			
Follow-up and in-service for beginning and experienced teachers are to be ensured.			